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The history of Turner's Paddock, the proposed site of an archaeological investigation by the Flinders University of South Australia, is a reflection of the overall use of the Parklands by the Adelaide City Council. It was both a refuse dump and a depasturing site.

In understanding the processes which created the refuse dump in the area now called Turner's paddock one must look to the whole picture of rubbish disposal in Adelaide. Through this picture one can obtain an idea of what was being dumped, how it was dumped and the volumes of material being dumped; over what time span the area was used and when the processes of creating the site slowed down or ended, and how this site relates to other sites around Adelaide. Thus Chile this may not be the most useful of the refuse sites to excavate, external factors mean that this is the site which is available and is likely to be disturbed in the near future. Research of the site history is invaluable in making the excavation an effective process.

Turner's Paddock is situated in the West Parklands, and is bordered by Burbridge Road on the North, the Railway lines on the West boundary, the West Terrace Cemetery on the South Boundary and the Roman Catholic Cemetery Road on the West side. Across from this road are parklands, which extend to West Terrace. The site itself covers 27.64 hectares (Land Title) and is currently owned by the Catholic Church Endowment Society Inc., who pay the land tax for the area. The purchase of the area occurred in August 1984. The registered proprietor was the Minister Of Public Works (Land Title).

The paddock is designated as section PT 6023, of the overall area DP 23350 on the Surveyor-General's plan of the city of Adelaide. This area is inclusive of the whole of the western parklands, While the area of the Parklands between Burbridge Road and Anzac Highway is also designated as Park 23 section 436 (Land Title).

The name Turner's Paddock comes from the use of the paddock by the company Turner's Butchers, who pastured their horses there. This was mainly in the 1920s and 1930s, before the widespread use of motor vans (Mr Andrew Just, Turner's Smallgoods: pers.comm.). The use of the paddock appears to have been a verbal understanding, as there is no information about the paddock's leasing in the General Registry Office in Adelaide.

In considering the use of Turner's Paddock and its value as a historical site or as a site with archaeological potential, one must consider its particular context and why it was used in a particular way. For Turner's Paddock, its overall context is as part of the City of Adelaide. Further its use was dictated by the City's representatives, the City Of Adelaide Council. The control of the parklands was assumed by the City of Adelaide Council. Although the parklands were intended for public use and enjoyment, the Council and Adelaide's inhabitants were to exploit the parklands for their resources; as a source of material for brick-making, for lime and stone, and as a place to dispose of refuse and street-sweepings.

The opening of the Australian continent to colonisation prompted much thought and discussion about the establishing of societies and the development of colonies. In 1830 Edward Gibbon Wakefield and Robert Gouger founded the National Colonization Society in England. The aims of the society included the practical application of ideas of colonisation (Gibbs 1982: 21). The distribution of land was central to this application. The colonies so far founded did not have a systematic land distribution system, and settlement was in effect random. Wakefield believed that planned emigration was the key to a colony's success. Land would be sold for a fixed price rather than be given away as free grants, the money thus raised would be used to pay the passage of labourers from England. The price of land would be fixed so that labourers must work a number of years (approximately three) in the colony before they could in turn afford to buy land and maintain the cycle.
(Richard 1986: 115 and 117). Thus labour was assured. There were to be no convicts or paupers in this idealised society, the state would not provide religious aid and freedom of worship was guaranteed (Main 1986: 97).

In 1834 the act allowing for a colony of 300,000 square miles to be established was passed by the British House of Commons. But the government would not be responsible financially for the colony and a Board of Commissioners, not the Government, would control emigration and land sales (Gibbs, 1982: 24). The running of the new colony was to be resided in the hands of a governor, who represented the British Government, and a Resident Commissioner, who would be appointed by a Board of Commissioners.

The Board of Commissioners, consisting of twelve members led by Colonel Robert Torrens, sold the first land allotments of the new colony of South Australia in 1835. These allotments were comprised of: one town acre to be in the capital and eighty acres of farming land outside the capital. These acres were sold at 20 shillings an acre (one pound) (Gibbs 1982: 26). The Foundation Act required land sales valued at 45,000 pounds to occur before settlement was to proceed (Main 1986: 97). The South Australian Company formed by George Fife Angas bought a large holding at a price of 12 shillings an acre. Thus the settlement of South Australia began.

The first emigrants set sail in February 1836 and arrived two and half months later. Colonel William Light was given the task of surveying the colony and establishing the site of the capital. After rejecting Kangaroo Island, which was already established as a whaling site and the site preferred by the South Australian Company, Light decided against the south coast near the River Murray Mouth and the Yorke Peninsula. Light finally settled on the Adelaide Plains area with its essential resources of fresh water and fertile soil. The site was established six miles inland, with a harbourage at an accessible distance (Gibbs 1982: 30 & 35). South Australia was declared a province of Great Britain on December 28th 1836, and its officials were sworn in (Gibbs 1982: 34).

Colonel Light had completed the preliminary survey for the new city by March 1837. The survey comprised 1042 acres, of which 700 one-acre lots formed South Adelaide and 342 one-acre lots formed North Adelaide on either side of the Torrens Valley (Gibbs 1982: 35-36). The city was laid out by William Light on a grid pattern, and included 17 main streets with five squares in South Adelaide and one in North Adelaide. The entire city was surrounded by a belt of parklands.

The initial population in 1836 was 546 people (Stevenson 1986: 175), by December 31st 1837 there were 2,000 people living on the Adelaide plains (Colwell & Naylor 1974: 28). The early years of the colony saw disagreements among the various officials, particularly among Governor Hindmarsh and James Hurtle Fischer, the Resident Commissioner (Colwell & Naylor 1974: 31). These incidents reflect the difficulties to be faced in having governing authority residing in two officials. South Australia was to have new governors every few years. In 1842 the Board of Commissioners was abolished and the Governor given sole control of the colony (Gibbs 1982: 46).

Land sales were essential to the new colony, and many sought to profit through land speculation. The city acres not purchased in Britain were sold at auction on March 23rd 1837, for between two and fourteen guineas. Resold a few weeks later they realised eighty to a hundred pounds an acre (Colwell & Naylor 1974: 28).

Adelaide was faced with an increasing residential population, it became essential to establish farming, the products of which would meet the colony's needs and make the colony economically viable. Colonel Light died in October 1839, and Governor Gawler...
employed Charles Sturt to survey the country areas of the colony. By mid-1841 500,000 acres were available for settlement, 170,000 of these acres had been sold by 1839 (Gibbs 1982: 43). Adelaide's population was expanding rapidly with 2,800 emigrants arriving in 1838; 4,600 in 1839 and 3,000 in 1840 (Gibbs 1982: 42).

The early settlement of Adelaide consisted of tents, mud and grass huts, and portable wooden houses. These houses were located near the Torrens and throughout the Parklands (Gibbs 1982: 50). The same parklands were quarried for limestone and sandstone to build cottages with. By 1842, Adelaide had 1,915 houses (Gibbs 1982: 47).

Small village settlements were to become established near Adelaide, usually centred on farming activities. Kent Town grew up around a flour mill built in 1840 by Dr Kent, while Bowden, Brompton and Croyden were brick making centres (Colwell & Naylor 1974: 36). But Adelaide remained the most heavily populated area. Sanitation and uncontaminated drinking water were concerns from almost the beginning. Newspapers such as the The Observer (1848) pointed out the dangers of disease caused by filthy water, open cesspools, and rotted fruit and vegetables in backyards (Colwell & Naylor 1974: 50). These conditions were exacerbated by the use of smaller lots to maximise profits by landholders. The West End of Adelaide was the centre of this activity, with cottages being built for workers and immigrants (Sumlering 1992: 28-9). Adelaide’s streets were equally notorious for their mud and impassability.

South Australia was to develop a wheat and wool based economy. In 1843 23,000 acres of wheat had been sown. Steady growth led to 175,865 acres being sown in 1857. It was not to be smooth sailing for the colony. Periodic droughts such as those in 1864-5 and 1880-82 caused major crop failures and heavy crop losses (Gibbs 1982: 78 & 83). The other basis of the South Australian economy was the copper mining industry. Mining began at Kapunda in 1843 and continued to 1886. Burra, one of the richest mines, was worked from 1845 to 1877. While the 1860s saw mining in the Moonta - Kadina area (Gibbs 1982: 97, 99 & 103). These expanding industries saw the movement of the population out of Adelaide’s city and suburbs and into the country. In 1841 nearly 70 percent of the population lived in Adelaide, by contrast in 1871 approximately 75 percent of the population lived outside of Adelaide and its environs (Stevenson 1986: 177).

The government of South Australia with the repealing of the South Australian Act of 1834 in 1842 was placed in the hands of the Governor and a seven member Legislative Council, whose members would be nominated by the Governor (Gibbs 1982: 161). The colonists protested against the control this gave the governor. In 1850 the British government passed the Australian Colonies Government Act, this allowed each colony to propose its own constitution. After a number of government changes, 1856 saw the adoption of a constitution allowing for two houses of Parliament: the thirty-six member House of Assembly was to be elected by all men, and the Legislative Council of eighteen members was to be elected by men owning a minimum of fifty pounds worth of land (Gibbs 1982: 115). At the same time as the colonial government was being established, the Municipal Council of Adelaide was also being arranged (1840) and its first mayor was James Hurtle Fischer, the former Resident Commissioner. The council was dissolved by Governor Grey in August 1843 (Gibbs 1982: 47). The council was reinstated in 1852.

By 1893 Adelaide’s population had reached 131,000, out of a total population of 315,200 (Gibbs 1982: 157). Fresh water for drinking was provided by the Thorndon Reservoir (1860), the Hope Valley Reservoir (1872) and Happy Valley Reservoir (1897). The sewerage system was in place by 1880-81 (Gibbs 1982: 162). Gas lighting had illuminated Adelaide’s streets from 1863, while the Adelaide Electric Supply Company built the first power station at Port Adelaide in 1899. The Tramways Act of 1876 heralded the linking of
Adelaide to its suburbs (Gibbs 1982: 161, 163 & 168). The railways were developed in South Australia primarily to provide the means of transporting goods. The Adelaide to Port Adelaide line was opened in April 1856; the Gawler line in 1857, and the Burra connection in 1870 (Colwell & Naylor 1974: 56).

Adelaide was a thriving city with most of the problems of a city. The West End was notorious for its slums, gambling, prostitutes and grog sellers (Sumerling 1992: 33-34). The turn of the century saw the development of small factories in Adelaide; products made included: clothing, footwear, biscuits and furniture (Gibbs 1982: 181). In 1907, there were 1,086 small factories in Adelaide. Adelaide from early on had been a mixture of businesses, factories and residential homes. In 1880-81 661 warehouses, workshops and stables existed in the city, while in 1883-84, Adelaide had 6771 houses and buildings (Sumerling 1992: 29). These buildings, whatever their individual functions, had one thing in common, they produced refuse that had to be collected and disposed of. The Adelaide City Council was to use the Parklands as a place to dispose of refuse, street sweepings and night soil from the early days of the city till the completing of the refuse destructor in 1910.

To understand the site formation processes which occurred at Turner's Paddock, one must consider the history of refuse disposal in Adelaide as a whole. This history provokes a number of questions, in particular the value of excavating just one of the Parklands dumps, and how representative one site can be. Further whether using one site might misrepresent trends being observed in the archaeological record. Equally it may provide information about goods such as ceramics, where documentation may indicate the accuracy of perceived trends. The Turner's Paddock site was one of a considerable number of locations used for rubbish disposal in the parklands, and while it is possible through council records to identify which were used for trade refuse, this is no guarantee that the trade refuse was not deposited in dumps elsewhere. It is most likely that Turner's Paddock was used primarily for household refuse.

There are no specific references to Turner's Paddock in the council records, rather there are references to West Terrace dumps, of which there were at least three. One was located just south of the West Terrace Cemetery and north of Bay Road (Anzac Highway), another was located behind the now demolished Observatory, which was situated on West Terrace between Burbridge and Port Roads (Mayor's Annual Report 1903: 28). It is worth noting that these are the ones mentioned by the subcommittee of the Parks Committee looking into sites still available for refuse dumping in 1903, and other sites in the West Parklands may have existed.

It is possible to consider the problem of refuse disposal in terms of economic trends in Adelaide, linking the problems of financing a refuse destructor with depressions in the economy. But this may cloud the picture, and it seems more probably that the dangers of disease and the pressing concern of lack of areas in which to dump refuse were key factors in the constructing of the refuse destructor, combined with a general tendency of restraining spending until there is no other course. The construction of a refuse destructor was linked with the more thorny problem of the abattoirs in the same Bill, and this saw the continual defeat of the proposal until 1907 (Mayor's Annual Report 1902: 21; & 1907: 12).

It is possible to trace the history of refuse disposal in Adelaide through the Adelaide City Council's Digests of Proceeding and the Mayor's Annual Reports, which contain his report and reports by individuals like the Health Officer and the Park Lands Ranger and so on. These are available for reading in the City Of Adelaide Archives. Through these it is possible to build up a picture, if not a complete one, of rubbish disposal in Adelaide. The information can be grouped into the following headings: rubbish collection, refuse dumps, and the refuse destructor.
The earliest reference to rubbish collection in the City of Adelaide occurs in the Mayor's Annual Report for 1877-78 (p 18), when the Mayor notes that 140 officers and labourers, 35 horses and drays, and 11 hydrostatic vans were employed to scavenge and remove house refuse.

By 1879-80 all house refuse was being removed by contractors, and there were calls for tri-weekly collections of household refuse, particularly in hot weather (City of Adelaide Mayor's Annual Report 1879-80: 58 & 66). The problem of the accumulation of refuse in backyards was to be an on-going problem over the years, and is first mentioned in 1879-80 (Mayor's Annual Report 1879-80: 58). There were to be difficulties in using contractors to remove house refuse.

The city of Adelaide and North Adelaide was divided into six wards: Hindmarsh (162 town acres in the NE of the city); Gawler (160 acres in the NW); Young (220 acres in the SE); Robe (168 acres of West North Adelaide); and MacDonell (172 acres of East North Adelaide) (Sumerling 1992: 29). Each of these areas were tendered for separately, for example in 1881 the following tenders were accepted: Gawler Ward M.R. Fleming 5151 (pounds); Hindmarsh Ward - M. Fitzgerald 4991.; Grey Ward - R. Deacon 2601.; Young Ward - M. Murphy 2341. 15s.; Robe Ward - M. Fitzgerald 2501. 8s.; and MacDonell - W. Kelly 2581. As. 6d.. In each case it was the cheapest tender that was accepted (Digest of the Proceedings of the City Council December 19th 1881). It was this that was to cause problems. The contractors would only remove the types of refuse listed in the contract and only from boxes as specified, extra payment was required to have any other household refuse removed (Mayor's Annual Report 1886-87: 67). Regular collections were not guaranteed; complaints about the collectors were frequent and heavy fines imposed to no avail (Mayor's Annual Report 1888-89: 92; 1891-92: 82). In 1892-93 in the face of greater expenditure the City Council decided to employ day labourers, under the direct supervision of the City Surveyor, to collect the city's refuse. The estimated cost of this was 650 pounds a year (Mayor's Annual Report 1892-93: 17). The total cost of house refuse removal for the year was 1,950 pounds per year, but on the positive side the City Surveyor received no complaints about the collections (Mayor's Annual Report 1892-93: 64).

The continuing need to deal with the refuse produced by a growing city was reflected in the calls for increased staff for the Hindmarsh and Gawler wards with their increasing number of tenements producing more refuse (Mayor's Annual Report 1897-98: 88). The pressure on the service was to increase. In 1901 the City Engineer and Surveyor reports that despite the large increase in house refuse work, the streets were still being scavenged twice a week, and some daily (Mayor's Annual Report 1901: 24). In 1901 rubbish was still being removed by open, horse-drawn drays and rubbish bins were open boxes, tubs and buckets (Mayors Annual Report 1901: 7 and 16). It is likely that this added to street pollution and probably was a contributing factor in the disease problems of the city. It was not until 1906 that the Adelaide Council was to provide 10,557 rubbish receptacles to householders (Mayor's Annual Report 1906: 76), which gives some indication of the volume of rubbish being removed. While in 1909 the Council spent 1,000 pounds on new dust carts (Mayor's Annual Report 1909: 25), 1911 saw the purchase of carts designed especially for paper collection in the city (Mayor's Annual Report 1911: 74).

One of the main problems with refuse was the definition of what constituted house refuse. The city householders had been issued, in 1883, with printed instructions as to what constituted house refuse as from trade refuse (Mayor's Annual Report 1883-84: 114). What was not collected was cause for concern for the city's Health Officer, as scavengers were refusing to remove old tins, boots, mattresses etc., which had been left by people
vacating houses: "I consider that everything for which there is no further use should be considered as house refuse, and should be promptly removed by scavengers." (Mayor's Annual Report 1898-99: 197). The repeated calls for sanitary refuse collection and disposal by the Health Officer suggest that he and the Local Board of Health had little authority within the Council hierarchy.

The problem with refuse build up near to houses is reflected by the fact that 718 dray-loads of rubbish were removed from backyards, lanes, rights of way and vacant allotments during a systematic inspection of the city (Mayor's Annual Report 1901:35), with 23 loads delivered to rubbish tips in a fortnight; there was also concern about the rats in the city and dumps (Meeting of the Local Board of Health October 8th 1900: no page numbers on documents). It is difficult from the council records to be specific about average quantities of refuse collected and dumped into the tips. The Notice Paper of the Meeting of the Local Board of Health dated May 21st 1900 reported that 225 loads of private refuse were delivered to the tips, unfortunately it is not clear whether this figure represents a yearly total or a periodic clean-up. But in either case it provides an indication of the volume of refuse being dumped. Further information comes from the specifications issued for the refuse destructor tenders: "the maximum quantity of garbage collected by the 12 drays of 70 cubic feet capacity each, is about 34 tons per day of eight hours. The average being 30 tons a day. The garbage weight is about 10 cwt's. per cubic yard. The number of houses visited is about 8,000; dwellings are visited twice weekly, while hotels, boarding houses etc. are visited as often as is necessary" (Meeting of the City Council November 19th 1900 (report from 1899): 535).

These figures can be provide a guide to the quantity of refuse to be found at the dumps. The volume to be found at any one site is more problematic, and is likely to have been dictated by the nature of the area before dumping began. Some sites were pits created by the removal of blinding for road construction and material for bricks. In other areas the Council sought to level areas of the parklands, and to create a road along side the Slaughter House in the NE parklands (Mayor's Annual Report 1903: 28; & 1885-86: 108). It is unclear whether there was any specific order as to which dump was to be used when. Apparently each was used simultaneous until full or complaints were received by the Council about it, with new dumps being opened when necessary.

Throughout the Council records there are numerous references to house refuse, but few references to trade refuse. In 1877 memorials requesting the removal of trade refuse were submitted to Council by Adelaide merchants. In response the Council resolved to allow trade refuse to be dumped on Tuesday and Friday, when it would be burnt.

A Council employee would judge the charge for cartage and destruction for each load. A charge of 3s. 6d. per load for cartage and destruction, and 1s. for burning is mentioned. A trade refuse dump appears to have existed in the Northwest Parklands (Notice Paper of the Meeting of City Council March 26th 1877: 4 & 1). It seems highly likely that this is the same dump mentioned later in 1883-84 as being at the rear of the Slaughter House (north of Port Rd. Mayor's Annual Report 1883-84: 113). It seems that trade refuse only was burnt as a matter of course, as it contained a high proportion of animal and vegetable matter from the butchers and markets of the city; it was a necessity to keep disease and rats at bay.

There is no evidence of the burning of house refuse, but fires did occur in the rubbish dumps, apparently spontaneously and were difficult to control (Proceedings of City Council June 4th 1877: 4). Thus it is likely some ash and charred material will be evident when Turner's Paddock is excavated.
The use of the parklands as a site for dumping refuse goes back to the early days of the colony. The Council meeting of January 7th 1878 noted that it was common practice to dump dead animals on the parklands and the throwing of rubbish into the Torrens also caused problems from early on (Proceedings of the City Council Jan. 7th 1878: 6). It is possible to locate many of the parklands dumps as used by the Council through the Council Meetings and the Mayor's Annual Reports. The majority are mentioned when they were full and no longer usable or there were complaints from nearby residents. In 1903 a subcommittee of the Parks Committee indicated precisely the: "present sites of tips for street sweepings" and which were still usable for tipping in future (Town Clerks Annual Report 1903: 28). By plotting the sites mentioned throughout the Council record it may be possible to detect a pattern to the choice of areas as sites for refuse dumps. This might further provide a guide to how long Turner's Paddock was in use as a dump, as there are no specific references to its usage. It is clear that until at least 1910 that rubbish was still being deposited in the parklands at the dumps and as filling for levelling the parklands for playing fields in 1911 (Town Clerks Report 1910: 61; & 1911 32), but these dates can only be a guide to a possible termination date, it may have been earlier than this for Turner's Paddock.

The supervision of the refuse dumps came under the Park Land Ranger's Office, while the City Surveyor and Engineers Office dealt with the collection of refuse, and later with the availability of sites for refuse dumping (Town Clerk's Report 1906: 760. In 1877 the Health Committee recommend that a man be employed to attend to the rubbish heaps in the North and South Parklands. He would be under the supervision of the Park Land Ranger, and would work four days on the north dumps and two days on the south dumps (Notice Paper of Meeting of City Council January 22nd 1877: 8). In 1881-2 the council was allowing Mr P. Prisk, a marine store dealer, to remove material from the Council refuse dumps in exchange for the levelling of the dumps. Prisk continued to do the levelling until the period of 1899-1900, when the Council limited access to the dumps in response to an outbreak of bubonic plague in Sydney. Only Council employees were subsequently allowed access to cover the refuse (Mayor's Annual Report 1899-1900: 257-58). The marine store dealers were removing: rags, bones, cut glass; old iron, brass, copper, tin, zinc, lead and other metals; waste paper, old ropes, empty bottles (Mayor's Annual Report 1881-82: 127; & Digest of Proceedings of City Council December 4th 1882: 4). While Mr Prisk had the Council permission to remove material, there were others who worked the dumps unofficially. The Health Officer was to express concern repeatedly about the spreading of disease via the removal of infected clothing and bedding from the dumps (Mayor's Annual Report 1896-97: 68). The Council, in 1884, decided to charge Mr Prisk twenty-five pounds a year for the privilege of removing items from the dumps (Mayor's Annual Report 1884-85: 105). The City Engineer, in his report of 1896-97, charges that the Council benefiting from the contract with Mr Prisk used this as a good reason not to build a refuse destructor (Mayor's Annual Report 1896-97: 68).

That material was being removed from the dumps in the parklands is of particular importance for the archaeologist, as it is likely to affect the interpretations arising from the excavated materials. Of equal value is the information that refuse was dumped in layers from 3ft to 4ft deep and covered daily with soil (Mayor's Annual Report 1895-96: 55). Thus there is likely to be some form of stratigraphic divisions visible in the excavation sections. The very nature of a site, where material is being turned over would make dating using perceived levels problematic. From 1885 to 1889 household refuse was used to fill a billabong on the south and east sides of the Slaughter House (NW Parklands), which: "will be the means of affording better ingress & egress for cattle bought to our sale yards." (Mayor's Annual Report 1885-86: 108; & 1888-89: 138). Thus effectively Turner's Paddock represents a sample of household refuse from the period concerned, the nineteenth
century and the first decade of the twentieth century. The variable distribution of material throughout the parklands will make the detection of trends more difficult, similarly problems with linking material remains to economic periods also will occur. This is not to say that more generalised trends, such as the presence of particular imported items, will not be detectable through excavation. But an awareness of factors contributing to site formation are particularly important in considering Turner's Paddock.

Public feeling was to swing against the use of the parklands for refuse dumps. The Advertiser of October 17th 1899 had a lead article entitled 'Our Parkland', in which it condemned the degrading of the parklands by the dumping of refuse, and by heaps of road metal and other requisites for road formation (Mayor's Annual Report 1899-1900: 135). 1903 saw the recommendation that all permanent depots in the parklands be fenced and hidden with hedges as soon as possible (Mayor's Annual Report 1903: 29). The Council by now was faced with the closure of the dumps, and in 1905 the City Engineer reported the dumps would only be usable for another three years. The matter reached crisis point in 1907, when the Council was faced with employing extra drays at 1,200 pounds a year to cart refuse to the only rubbish dump still viable, the dump in the Slaughter House paddock, which was near houses in Thebarton. In October of the same year a loan of 17,000 pounds was approved to fund the building of a refuse destructor. It was then found that the Council had no legal right to dump refuse on to the Parklands. The refuse destructor was finally forced upon the Council (Mayor's Annual Report 1907: 31, 12 & 28).

The question of establishing furnaces for the burning of refuse and doing away with the dumps had been first raised in 1882-83, but the rate-payers would not authorize the necessary loan (Mayor's Annual Report 1882-83: 123). The Health Officer called repeatedly for a furnace over the years, and in 1885 it was estimated that the furnace would cost 1,000 pounds to build and 300 pounds a year in wages to run (Mayor's Annual Report 1885-86: 17). The Council considered the matter again in 1891-92, and ordered surveys about the refuse destructors in Melbourne, Sydney and England (Mayor's Annual Report 1891-92: 91); Sydney promised a copy of their report on destructors on its completion (Mayor's Annual Report 1895: 88). By 1897-98 the cost of the destructor had risen to 5,000 pounds. The destructor was postponed again pending consideration of the abattoirs scheme in 1898 (Mayor's Annual Report 1897-98: 88; 1898-99: 144). While 1899-1900 saw tenders being called for a destructor, it was rejected along with the abattoirs in 1901 (Mayor's Annual Report 1899-1900: 136; & 1901:5). The problem continued in 1902 when a Bill for a Refuse Destructor and Abattoirs was defeated before the Select Committee of the Legislative Council (Mayor's Annual Report 1902: 21). When the Council sought Parliamentary sanction for a loan in 1905, Parliament responded by forbidding the building of a destructor in the parklands (Mayor's Annual Report 1905: 25).

The Council was to finally authorize the borrowing of 17,000 pounds for a refuse destructor in August 12th and tenders were called for on October 21st 1907 (Mayor's Annual Report 1907: 12). In March of 1908 the council purchased two acres of land in Halifax and Gilles streets on which to build a refuse destructor, at a cost of 5,850 pounds (Mayor's Annual Report 1908: 4). The successful tender was from Heenan & Froude Ltd. of Manchester, with the modification that the destructor be electrically powered rather than steam driven. The price was 19,742 pounds, and work started the same year (Mayor's Annual Report 1909: 6 & 72). By 1910 the destructor was complete, the by-products of the furnace were to be used to make flagstones. The City Engineer in his report of 1911 noted that refuse destructor sales included: flagstones, tin bales, clinker, glass and cast iron, with the flue dust being taken to a tip (Mayor's Annual Report 1911: 76). The completion of the refuse destructor did not stop the use of the parklands for house refuse completely. The Council gave permission for the tipping of refuse and spoil into hollows near the Slaughter
House to create level ground for playing sports on, this was expected to take several years (Mayor's Annual Report 1911: 32).

Thus it is possible to build a picture of refuse disposal in Adelaide, a picture involving the collection of refuse, rubbish dumps in the parklands, and the need for a sanitary means of refuse disposal, via a furnace. Turner's Paddock is one element of this picture. Although direct references to the paddock are rare, the information available can be used to understand and interpret what is actual found during excavation.

The site history effectively leads to questions concerning the attitudes of Adelaide's occupants, both those with Council authority and the average man, to refuse and the broader questions of illness and disease arising from refuse disposal practices. Adelaide's practices can be compared to those of other Australian colonies and beyond this to London's practices as indicated in works like Henry Mayhew's London Labour and The London Poor (1967 reprint: 171-2, 199-200, 281, 284 & 286). Such works also give an insight to the recycling of refuse, which is reflected in Adelaide's refuse destructor sales.

Another area which may be of interest in interpreting the context of the Turner's Paddock site, is the history of the West Terrace Cemetery. Through the Mayor's Annual Reports it is clear that the cemetery was considered a health risk, and there were repeated attempts to have it closed (Mayor's Annual Report 1877-8: 66: 1878-9: 52: and through to 1897-8: 69). It is interesting that the refuse dump in close proximity did not arouse such condemnation.

The Council from its early days had used the Parklands as a source of revenue. It obtained income from depasturing licences for cattle, sheep and horses. In 1872 it received 1,394 pounds from licences, by 1882 this had risen to 2,031 pounds as against an expenditure of 74 pounds a year (Daly 1987: 120). Sales of dead wood as firewood netted the Council several hundred pounds as did sales of limestone (Daly 1987: 121). The dumping of refuse in the parklands was probably seen as an natural extension of this activity.

The history of refuse in Adelaide is very much a history of the city, as it reflects the behaviour of the city's occupants. In some ways Turner's Paddock is an ideal site for an excavation as the site has undergone few disturbances since it was formed as a refuse dump.

The history of the site will be expanded by excavation as there are few clues as to the actual extant of the dump itself and how long it was used for.